

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00337 01 OF 02 051655Z

42

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 112796

P R 051545Z SEP 75

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2768

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 SALT TWO GENEVA 337

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJ: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 5, 1975
(SALT TWO-771)

THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR
JOHNSON AT THE SALT TWO MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 5, 1975.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON

SEPTEMBER 5, 1975

MR. MINISTER,

I

TODAY I WANT FURTHER TO DISCUSS THE US PROPOSAL FOR PARAGRAPH
2(B) OF ARTICLE XVIII OF THE JOINT DRAFT TEXT. THIS PROPOSAL
DEALS WITH THE OBLIGATION OF THE SIDES, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK
OF THE SCC, TO AGREE UPON PROCEDURES AND DATES FOR REPLACEMENT,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00337 01 OF 02 051655Z

DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION, AND CONVERSION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE

ARMS AS WELL AS THE NOTIFICATIONS RELATED TO THESE ACTIVITIES.

II

I PARTICULARLY WANT TO ADDRESS THE SOVIET OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSAL TO GIVE THE SCC THE FUNCTION OF AGREEING UPON PROCEDURES AND DATES FOR REPLACEMENT AND CONVERSION ACTIVITIES. THE SOVIET SIDE STATED THAT THIS OBJECTION WAS BASED ON THE GROUNDS THAT A REQUIREMENT TO AGREE ON PROCEDURES AND DATES FOR REPLACEMENT AND CONVERSION ACTIVITIES WOULD CONFLICT WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF FREEDOM TO DETERMINE THE COMPOSITION OF THE STRATEGIC FORCES OF A SIDE, AS WELL AS THE RIGHT OF A SIDE TO MODERNIZE AND REPLACE ITS STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS.

AS I HAVE SAID BEFORE, THE PROCEDURES AND DATES RELATED TO REPLACEMENT AND CONVERSION ACTIVITIES ARE NOT INTENDED TO LIMIT A SIDE'S FREEDOM OF ACTION WITH RESPECT TO HOW, AT WHAT RATE, OR ON WHAT CALENDAR DATES REPLACEMENT AND CONVERSION WOULD BE CARRIED OUT. RATHER, IT IS INTENDED THAT THE SIDES AGREE UPON PROCEDURES AND DATES -- THAT IS, RECOGNIZABLE MILESTONES IN REPLACEMENT OR CONVERSION PROGRAMS -- WHICH WOULD REGISTER THE MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE SIDES AS TO WHEN AND UNDER WHAT CRITERIA A SYSTEM WOULD BE SUBJECT TO OR REMOVED FROM THE LIMITATIONS OF THE AGREEMENT.

III

AS I SAID IN MY STATEMENT ON AUGUST 15, THE US SIDE BELIEVES THAT IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO HAVE PROCEDURES FOR REPLACING AND OLD SYSTEM WITH A NEWER SYSTEM, ESPECIALLY WHEN A SIDE IS AT OR NEAR THE LEVELS OF THE TOTAL NUMBERS PERMITTED BY THE NEW AGREEMENT. WITHOUT REPEATING THE RATIONALE GIVEN IN THAT STATEMENT, I WANT TO STATE THAT THE US BELIEVES THAT THE CRITERIA ASSOCIATED WITH REMOVING AN INDIVIDUAL ARM FROM THE AGGREGATE LIMITATION, AND THE CRITERIA FOR BRINGING ANOTHER ARM INTO THE AGGREGATE MUST BE RELATED TO EACH OTHER AND INCORPORATED INTO AGREED PROCEDURES.

THE SOVIET SIDE HAS STATED, HOWEVER, THAT THE QUESTIONS RAISED IN MY STATEMENT OF AUGUST 15 HAVE ALREADY BEEN RESOLVED. IT IS
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00337 01 OF 02 051655Z

MAINTAINED THAT PARAGRAPHS 2 AND 3 OF ARTICLE VI OBVIATE THE NEED TO AGREE ON PROCEDURES AND DATES FOR REPLACEMENT AND CONVERSION ACTIVITIES. IT IS TRUE THAT, AS THE SOVIET SIDE SAYS, ARTICLE VI SETS FORTH THOSE STAGES IN THE LIFE CYCLE OF INDIVIDUAL ARMS WHEN THEY ARE CONSIDERED TO BE INCLUDED WITHIN THE 2400 AGGREGATE LIMITATION. THE DETAILS OF THIS PROVISION WILL MOST LIKELY BE INCORPORATED INTO THE PROCEDURES TO BE AGREED IN THE SCC. IT IS ALSO TRUE, AS PROVIDED FOR IN PARAGRAPH

3 OF ARTICLE VI, THAT AREMS SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS PROVIDED FOR IN THE NEW AGREEMENT WOULD CONTINUE TO BE SUBJECT TO THOSE LIMITATIONS UNTIL THEY ARE DISMANTLED OR DESTROYED UNDER PROCEDURES AGREED UPON IN THE SCC. THE ABOVE MENTIONED PROVISIONS ARE NOT SUFFICIENT, HOWEVER, TO GIVE THE SCC THE COMPETENCE TO INCORPORATE THE SPECIFIC DETAILS OF ARTICLE VI AS WELL AS OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE NEW AGREEMENT INTO WORKABLE PROCEDURES WHICH IMPLEMENT THE TOTALITY OF THE APPROPRIATE OBLIGATIONS ASSUMED UNDER THAT AGREEMENT. ON THE OTHER HAND, PARAGRAPH 2(B) OF ARTICLE XVIII OF THE US DRAFT EXPRESSLY ASSIGNS THIS COMPETENCE TO THE SCC. SINCE THIS FUNCTION OF THE SCC IS TO BE ONE OF ITS MOST IMPORTANT, THE US BELIEVES IT SHOULD BE EXPLICITLY STATED IN THE APPROPRIATE ARTICLE OF THE NEW AGREEMENT.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00337 02 OF 02 051700Z

41

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 112877

P R 051545Z SEP 75

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2769

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 SALT TWO GENEVA 337

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

THERE IS PRECEDENT BOTH FOR AGREEING TO ESTABLISH AND ALSO FOR ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES AS TO WHEN AND UNDER WHAT CRITERIA VARIOUS STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS WILL BECOME SUBJECT TO AND CEASE TO BE SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS OF AN AGREEMENT. IN AN AGREED INTERPRETATION OF THE INTERIM AGREEMENT, THE SIDES AGREED TO ACCOMPLISH DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS UNDER PROCEDURES TO BE AGREED IN THE SCC.

ACCORDINGLY, IN THE PROTOCOL ON PROCEDURES GOVERNING REPLACEMENT, DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION, AND NOTIFICATION THEREOF, FOR STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS, DATES JULY 3, 1974, THE PARTIES AGREED BOTH ON CRITERIA FOR WHAT CONSTITUTES DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION OF ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS AND ALSO CRITERIA AS TO DATES, THAT IS, WHEN REPLACEMENT SLBM LAUNCHERS BECOME SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS OF THE INTERIM AGREEMENT. UNDER THE NEW AGREEMENT THERE WILL BE A NEED TO AGREE ON SIMILAR PROCEDURES AND DATES FOR THE VARIOUS STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS TO BE LIMITED. PARAGRAPH 2(B) OF ARTICLE XVIII BUILDS UPON THE PAST EXPERIENCE OF THE SIDES IN IMPLEMENTING PROCEDURES FOR REPLACEMENT AND DESTRUCTION OR DISMANTLING ACTIVITIES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00337 02 OF 02 051700Z

IN ORDER TO MAKE THE ABOVE STATED VIEWS UNMISTAKABLY CLEAR, THE US PROPOSES THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE FOR PARAGRAPH 2(B) OF ARTICLE XVIII OF THE JOINT DRAFT TEXT.

THE PARTIES WILL:

"(B) AGREE UPON PROCEDURES AND DATES FOR DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS IN CASES PROVIDED FOR BY THE PROVISIONS OF THIS AGREEMENT, AND AGREE UPON PROCEDURES AND DATES WHICH WOULD PROVIDE CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN THE LIMITATIONS OF THIS AGREEMENT OR REMOVAL THE REFORM OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS LIMITED BY THIS AGREEMENT DURING THE COURSE OF REPLACEMENT OR CONVERSION. NOTIFICATION OF DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION, REPLACEMENT, AND CONVERSION ACTIVITIES SHALL BE GIVEN TWICE ANNUALLY. SUCH NOTIFICATION SHALL INCLUDE ACTIONS COMPLETED IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS, CURRENTLY UNDERWAY, AND TO BE TAKEN OVER THE NEXT SIX MONTHS;"

V

MR. MINISTER, THE REVISED FORMULATION OF PARAGRAPH 2(B) OF ARTICLE XVIII WHICH I HAVE JUST DISCUSSED WILL, IN OUR VIEW, ENHANCE THE VIABILITY OF THE NEW AGREEMENT.
JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: WITHDRAWAL OF MEMBERSHIP, EXPULSIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 SEP 1975
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GarlanWA
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975SALTT00337
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750307-0891
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750979/aaaacsci.tel
Line Count: 212
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GarlanWA
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 13 JUN 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <13 JUN 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <17 JUL 2003 by GarlanWA>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 5, 1975 (SALT TWO-771)
TAGS: PFOR, SY, EG, IS, UN, NAC
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006